1 (The following proceedings were had in open court:) 2 THE CLERK: Case 19 C 6332, NHC v. Centaur 3 Construction. 4 MS. MARZIANI: Good morning, your Honor. Gini 5 Marziani on behalf of the plaintiff. MR. WATTERS: Good morning, your Honor. Zack Watters 6 7 also on behalf of the plaintiff. 8 MR. GAVRILOS: Good morning, your Honor. Constantine 9 Gavrilos on behalf of the defendants and third-party 10 respondents. 11 MS. HERRING: Kim Herring on behalf of the same. 12 THE COURT: Okay. We're going to talk about the 13 status report filing issues and then the matters that are 14 contained in it last. 15 There's two pending motions that I'm going to deal 16 with before that. The first is the motion, it's docket 17 number 462, by respondent McFadden for reconsideration. The 18 motion's denied. 19 So what motions for reconsideration are supposed to 20 be for are things that -- where the Court overlooked "Overlooked" doesn't mean got wrong. "Overlooked" 21 something. 22 means I missed something, evidence that was filed, or I 23 overlooked an argument or I overlooked a response to an 24 argument or something like that. 25 That's not what this motion says. The motion

basically asks for a do-over. It asks for a do-over. And it's not an appropriate motion to reconsider. It's denied.

I know you disagree with pretty much everything that I have done in this case on the defense and respondents' side. Your remedy is on the 27th floor of this building. You know, once you have an appealable order, you can enter it.

So that's the ruling on the motion to reconsider in that case -- on that matter. That's docket number 462.

By the way, there's some points in there that may be brand new points that weren't made before. That's equally an improper basis for a motion to reconsider because those points are considered to have been forfeited which they are in this case.

The new motion to reconsider which got filed yesterday or the day before, yesterday, docket number 474, that's Mr. Alexopoulos' motion to reconsider, that's a complete do-over. That's denied for that reason. I don't even require a response on that.

So, look, I have to say this. On some of these arguments, I've heard the same argument three and four times that I'm now hearing it again. And to me, at this point, this is a strategy in this case to basically just keep papering the case and keep filing stuff over and over again so that nothing ever happens.

We're done with it, okay? There's no more motions to

reconsider. They're going to be denied on their face unless they actually are proper motions to reconsider, which neither one of these came within shouting distance of being. So that motion's denied.

So now we're done with the motions to reconsider. Now we're going to talk about the status report.

I don't know why it is that you guys, unlike basically every lawyer in all of the 279 cases that I have besides this one -- now, some people just blow dates. It's like the people in the last case and the people on the phone. That happens. I get that.

That's not what's happening here. You guys can't get your act together about who gets who a draft when. Everybody else in the entire civilized legal world figures this out on their own. We have a report due by the judge -- from the judge -- or with the judge on such-and-such a date, one side is going to get a draft X days before, the other side is going to send their draft Y days before, and everybody gets it figured out.

Doesn't seem to work out for you guys. I don't know why, and, honestly, I don't really care. Don't really care.

Doesn't really matter. All I know is I'm not -- you're not doing what you're supposed to do.

And so you're done with warnings. There's not going to be any more warnings. There's not going to be any more

orders to show cause. If I don't get something when I'm supposed to get it, there's going to be a monetary sanction right then. Today is your warning. There's going to be strict compliance with dates. If I don't get something when I tell you that you have to file on such-and-such a date, then there's going to be a sanction. And it's going to be against everybody who didn't comply, which is going to be everybody because if you don't file a status report, that means none of you did it.

So no more warning shots, nothing like that.

And what I've learned in this case, and I learned it the most recently from the last go-round because when I issued -- when I didn't get the joint status report on the 29th and I issued the order on the 30th ordering you show cause why you shouldn't be sanctioned for not cooperating and filing a joint status report, I got one the same day. Look how easy that was? You know what, the message I got from that? All I have to do is threaten you. The threats work.

So now you're being permanently threatened because you're under the cloud of a threat for the rest of the case.

You've told me by your actions that threats work, so that's what you're going to get from now on. It's going to be -- you've got a standing threat of a sanction if you don't comply with an order. It's going to be a monetary sanction, and it's going to be a written order that names you; that

names you.

Now we're going to talk about the stuff that's actually in the status report.

First thing is -- okay. I'm looking at the status report, which is docket number 472. NHC section has items 1 through 6. First is birth date year that was redacted from the trust documents. That's been provided, so that's a moot point.

Hard copies of the photographs that were referenced in the June 17th status report, I'm told by the plaintiff that there's no photo of the Ducati, D-U-C-A-T-I. I'm told by the defendant on page 4, paragraph B, subparagraph 1, that defendants produced photographs of the vehicles, plural, which would include that one.

So this is an ascertainable fact. It's an ascertainable fact. Somebody has told me a lie. Somebody has told me a lie. One side said, I didn't get it, the other side said, we gave it to them. So we're going to find out today who told me a lie, and then that person is going to be punished.

So who told me a lie? Anybody want to volunteer, fess up?

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, the only thing I'll say on this point, and I didn't bring the --

THE COURT: So we're going to be -- we're going to be

1 talking about testimony under oath here. 2 MR. GAVRILOS: Sure. 3 THE COURT: Testimony under oath. And when I 4 conclude it's a lie, it's going to be perjury, okay? 5 18 United States Code Section 1621 and 1623. 6 MR. GAVRILOS: Sure. And --7 THE COURT: Criminal statute. 8 MR. GAVRILOS: 9 THE COURT: There's going to be a referral to the 10 U.S. Attorney's Office. 11 So did you yourself turn over a photograph of the 12 Ducati after I entered the order? 13 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, in the physical photos 14 that we provided, and I can picture it in my mind, which is 15 why I'm reasonably confident that it was produced, the Ducati 16 was under a tarp in the photo. 17 If you guys have the photo production, we can leaf 18 through it right now, but the reason why I'm confident in 19 saying that is because I can picture the photo of the Ducati 20 in my mind. 21 MR. WATTERS: Do you have the photos? 22 MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, if I might speak? 23 THE COURT: You can answer my question. Did you get 24 a photo of the Ducati, yes or no? 25 MS. MARZIANI: The Ducati is a motorcycle. We did

1 get pictures of the cars. 2 THE COURT: Okay. So did you hear my question? 3 MS. MARZIANI: I did. 4 THE COURT: You're not answering it. 5 MS. MARZIANI: We did not get a picture of the 6 Ducati. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Did you get something that was under a tarp? 9 MS. MARZIANI: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Why would you -- if I asked you to 11 send a picture of a vehicle -- so if I say, send a picture of 12 me and I go -- and I take a picture of me like this, is that a 13 picture of me? Of course it's not. 14 Why did you send a picture of something under a tarp? 15 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor --16 THE COURT: Can somebody lift the freaking tarp? 17 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, if we can look through the 18 pictures, I think it might be lifted and not be completely 19 concealed. 20 My -- I guess my answer is I didn't take that photo. 21 I can only provide what was provided to us. 22 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, if I may? 23 THE COURT: No. There's a question pending, and the 24 next thing that's going to happen is an answer to that 25 question.

1 (Brief pause.) 2 MR. GAVRILOS: Are those black-and-white photos? 3 ones that I gave you were color. 4 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, if I may? The photos? 5 THE COURT: Is that going to include a photo with 6 something under a tarp? 7 MR. WATTERS: It does, but it's clearly not a 8 motorcycle. 9 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, the photos that I produced 10 were color photos. 11 THE COURT: Did you bring them with you? Did you --12 MR. GAVRILOS: I did not --13 THE COURT: -- bring -- this is an issue up today. 14 The order today said, The parties should be prepared to 15 address in full the matters discussed in the parties' separate 16 status report, of which this is one. And you knew that there 17 was a dispute over this. Did you bring it with you? 18 MR. GAVRILOS: I did not bring the photos with me, 19 your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So that's going to be topic one 21 for the hearing where everybody testifies under oath. There's 22 going to be, photo of Ducati, yes or no? 23 All right. We're on to the next item. 24 Sworn declaration relating to the citation served on 25 Amundsen Davis as discussed during the hearing is to be

```
1
    produced by July 29th. Plaintiff says no declaration was
 2
    provided. The defendant's part, I don't believe --
 3
             MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor --
 4
             THE COURT: -- says that.
 5
             MR. GAVRILOS: -- our part said that we were
 6
    producing one, and I believe we indicated that we were
 7
    producing it by July 30th. We did not produce it by
 8
    July 30th, but we did produce it after that date.
 9
              THE COURT: When?
10
             MR. GAVRILOS: Was that Monday?
11
             THE COURT: So you mean like the day before
12
    yesterday?
13
             MR. GAVRILOS:
                             I believe so.
14
             THE COURT: So that's the 5th of August.
15
             MR. GAVRILOS:
                            Oh, no, Friday, Friday, your Honor.
16
             THE COURT: That's the 2nd of August.
17
             MR. GAVRILOS: Correct.
18
             THE COURT: Okay. Why wasn't it produced when -- you
19
    may have heard me talking on the phone. An order's a thing.
20
     It's not a suggestion. It's not like do this if you feel like
21
     it. It's do it, unless I've excused you from doing it. And
22
    nobody came in and said, hey, we can't do this by the 29th of
23
    July, Judge, we need until the 2nd of August.
24
             So why didn't it get produced on the date that you
25
    were ordered, O-R-D-E-R-E-D, to produce it?
```

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, we did our absolute best to get the signature from the client. There was a little bit of radio silence. We learned that the client was out of town, and it took several of the partners who outrank me quite a bit calling him directly to get his signature. As soon as we got that signature, we produced it.

THE COURT: Do you have the signature now?

MR. WATTERS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Item No. 4. Regarding the turnover of personal property items from Mr. Tsaparas and Mr. Alexopoulos,

personal property items from Mr. Tsaparas and Mr. Alexopoulos, dot, dot, information regarding the current status of the loan on the 2018 Suburban as well as the mileage and condition of the vehicle, photograph of the trailer, previously referenced photographs of the firearms.

So the plaintiff's part of the status report says, we got photographs of the firearms, we got info regarding the status of the loan, and the mileage and condition of the vehicle, but not a photograph regarding the trailer.

And then on the defendant's side -- well, so Section (b)(3) says, Reproduce the same vehicles, the firearms -- the same photos of firearms and vehicles. I don't know if vehicles includes trailer or not, but there's nothing specific on the trailer.

So did you send a photograph of the trailer?

MR. GAVRILOS: Not to my knowledge, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why not?

MR. GAVRILOS: We have not yet received one.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not going to try to count up here the stuff that has been filed on each side in this case, but suffice it to say that nobody has a problem filing stuff in this case. Nobody has a problem filing motions, motions to reconsider, due respect, motions to re-reconsider, and maybe a motion to re-re-reconsider, other stuff. Nobody has a problem filing stuff.

Did it occur to you to maybe say, oh, Judge, I can't comply with your order by the date you ordered me to comply with it by, I'd like an extension? I could say the same thing about this July 29th versus August 2nd thing. Did that occur to you? I'm under a court order, the court order isn't a suggestion, at least I don't think it's a suggestion, it's an order. Maybe I -- and I can't get the thing that the judge has told me to do by such-and-such a date, maybe I should ask for an extension.

Did that occur to you?

MR. GAVRILOS: It did not occur to me, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why the heck not?

MR. GAVRILOS: Ultimately, at the end of the day, we are trying to minimize the filings on this side, and --

THE COURT: Seriously? I mean, I got to tell you, that doesn't pass the straight-face test. I have two 15-page

motions to reconsider, okay? Again, some of them dealing with points I've dealt with multiple times.

Minimize the filings in this case, that's laughable. It's just laughable.

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, with respect to the turnovers of the judgment debtors' property, the judgment debtors have agreed to every single turnover that has been within reason. They agreed to the turnover of their bank accounts. They agreed to the wage deduction. All of these measures that have been properly brought before the Court we have agreed to. The orders have been by agreement of the parties.

And so there are some of these issues that we simply cannot agree to because it does not comport with the statute, it does not comport with the procedure. So --

THE COURT: Do you think that my order that you produce -- that you do the thing we're talking about right now didn't comport with the statute?

MR. GAVRILOS: No -- no, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because when you tell me -- when I say, why didn't you ask for an extension of time on the order, and then you go off into a discussion about things that don't comport with the statute, that kind of comes across to me like, Judge, your order was illegal, so I just kind of decided I wasn't going to comply with it.

And what happens to people who do that is they get held in contempt of court, and sometimes they go out of court through the side door. You know what's on the side door? It's a jail cell. Okay?

So that's how it came across to me when your response to my question about did you think about asking for an extension of time as you start devolving into a discussion about compliance with the law and whether the -- whether we've complied with the law or not. So --

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- you might want to rethink your approach.

MR. GAVRILOS: Yeah. I raised that to say that including the motions to reconsider, the defendants and third-party respondents collectively have affirmatively filed six things, and five of them were denied without briefing schedule in hand the following day.

So all of this is to say -- and it may have been an error in judgment, but I felt that my resources were better dedicated trying to get the photos as quickly as possible as opposed to diverting them to file a motion. Because as has been evident, it takes a little bit to get these documents, to get signatures.

THE COURT: So as of right now, do you have a photo of the trailer, yes or no?

1 MR. GAVRILOS: I don't believe so, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Here's the deal. Mr. Alexopoulos 2 3 -- it's his trailer, right? 4 MR. GAVRILOS: Correct. 5 THE COURT: Okay. He's to be in my courtroom at 9:00 6 o'clock in the morning carrying a photo, carrying a photo, 7 physically carrying a photo. I don't care where he is right 8 I don't care where he is right now. 9 MR. GAVRILOS: At 9:00 -- it's 10:00 o'clock in the 10 morning right now. 11 THE COURT: 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning carrying a 12 photo --13 MR. GAVRILOS: 0kay. 14 THE COURT: -- of the trailer. 15 And if he's not here, here's what's going to happen. 16 I'm going to place a call to the marshals service on the 24th 17 floor, I'm going to issue a warrant for his arrest for 18 contempt of court, and they're going to go out and get him. 19 And that's the way he'll come in here. 20 Now, there's one way that you can deal with that ahead of time, okay? If you -- when I say "you," I mean, you, 21 22 Mr. Gavrilos -- if you obtain a copy of a photograph of the 23 trailer today before 5:00 o'clock Central Standard -- Central 24 Daylight Time and walk it over to plaintiff's counsel's office 25 and then file an affidavit to me saying, I walked this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

photograph which I've attached to my affidavit over to plaintiff's counsel and left it off before 5:00 o'clock today, then I'll vacate the order that Mr. Alexopoulos has to be in here. And I will just point out we are in the year 2024. We're not in the year 1981, 2002, or anything like that. Somebody can take the device they have in their pocket or in their purse out, snap a photo, and they can text it to you, and then you can print it out from any printer, and you can walk it over there. It's not a hard thing to do. You know, in 1981, it would have been, but it isn't now. We're moving on to the next thing. That's item 5. With regard to the firearms that are the subject of the turnover order, the parties are directed to discuss in good faith arrangements for making the turnover. So the dispute seems to be NHC wants to say, Okay. give them us to and we'll sell them -- we'll arrange for them to be sold to a dealer in whatever state they're located in; and on defense side, we want 60 days, and he wants to sell them himself. Am I understanding the dispute correctly? MR. WATTERS: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Why does he want to sell them himself?

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, the trailer that we were

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

talking about is part of Mr. Alexopoulos' business, sportsman resource training. He's a firearms instructor. That's the business. So I don't know if you could find someone who would be able to sell them quicker and would have more connections in that market. I personally have never bought or sold a firearm, but I would imagine someone who's plugged into that industry would have a little bit better of a time doing so. THE COURT: Why don't you want him to sell them? MR. WATTERS: To be blunt, your Honor, Mr. Alexopoulos has been found liable for fraud, he's --THE COURT: You don't trust him. That's -- just get to the point. 14 MR. WATTERS: Correct. THE COURT: Okay. "Turn over" means turn over, okay? So you're going to -- it's going to be done the plaintiff's way here. MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, one thing that we discussed was the logistics of handing firearms from one party Ι to another and how that might present some novel issues. don't know if the Court is prepared to address those. Again, not being involved in -- with firearms, I generally don't know what those considerations are. So I would defer --THE COURT: Me neither, but, you know, just anecdotally from dealing with criminal gun possession cases

1 and other things like that, I have probably more than an 2 average person's awareness. 3 So, presumably, the smartest way to do it would be to 4 have somebody who is actually a firearm's dealer come pick 5 them up from Mr. Alexopoulos and that person goes and sells 6 them, because a licensed firearm dealer can do that and they 7 would know how to execute the transfer paperwork. You have to 8 document any kind of a firearms transfer because if you don't, 9 then it's potentially a crime. So that's presumably why it 10 was suggested that a firearms dealer do it. 11 So the deal is is that firearms that are the subject 12 of the July 12th turnover order are to be turned over to a 13 firearms -- to a licensed firearms dealer designated by -- one 14 or more licensed firearms dealer designated by the plaintiff 15 by three weeks from today. 16 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, can we put --17 THE COURT: That is the 28th of August. 18 MR. GAVRILOS: Can we put some sort of limitation on 19 like the location of the firearms dealer --20 THE COURT: Where's Mr. --21 MR. GAVRILOS: -- because Mr. Alexopoulos --22 THE COURT: Where are they? Are they in this state 23 or are they in Colorado?

MR. GAVRILOS: I believe they're in Illinois, your Honor.

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. 1 2 MR. GAVRILOS: I believe he lives in Niles, Illinois. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. GAVRILOS: So, I mean, Illinois is a big state. 5 I wouldn't want him to have to drive three hours. 6 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I think we just need to 7 clarify. I believe we're talking about firearms that are 8 owned not just by Mr. Alexopoulos but also by Mr. Tsaparas. 9 THE COURT: I thought there were some from each. 10 MR. WATTERS: There are. And so my understanding, 11 and counsel can certainly correct me if I'm wrong, but the 12 firearms owned by Mr. Tsaparas are in Colorado. 13 THE COURT: That sounds right to me. 14 MR. GAVRILOS: That's correct. I thought we were 15 just talking about the Alexopoulos firearms. 16 THE COURT: Okay. So I don't know -- so we know 17 Mr. Alexopoulos lives in Niles. 18 Where in Colorado does Mr. Tsaparas live, what town? 19 MR. GAVRILOS: I believe Pitkin County, your Honor; 20 Pitkin County. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. GAVRILOS: I believe it's maybe an hour and a 23 half outside of Colorado -- Denver. 24 THE COURT: Outside of Denver. 25 MR. GAVRILOS: Excuse me, outside of Denver.

THE COURT: Everything is an hour and a half outside of Denver.

MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, it's my understanding he's in or near the general Aspen area.

THE COURT: Oh, okay.

Well, to me, what makes the most sense is the firearms dealer goes to the guy and gets the firearms so that they don't have to be shlepping them across town because, again, I don't want anybody to get in trouble. And if Mr. Alexopoulos is driving guns from, you know, Niles to Joliet and runs a red light, that ain't going to be good.

So what ought to happen is that the firearms dealer ought to go to where -- go to the location at a time to be arranged, but it has to happen by the 28th of August in both locations.

Now we're on to item No. 6.

With regard to Mr. Tsaparas' vehicles that are the subject of the July 12th turnover order, which is the Ducati, the Lancia, and the Denali, the parties are to discuss in good faith agreed-upon arrangements for the transfer and sale.

So the plaintiff says, we -- here's the proposal we made. We didn't get a response. The defendants say -- hang on one second. There was one issue about that that was in here. Yeah.

No. I'm sorry. This is Tsaparas.

There we go.

As noted in his motion to claim exemptions,

Mr. Tsaparas wishes to apply his exemptions to his 2002 BMW so
that he too can sustain means of income and means to satisfy
the judgment entered against him.

Whatever. That's not one of the vehicles we're talking about. I mean, that was discussed in the last opinion that I issued back in July.

The BMW isn't at issue here. It's the other three things. And I get that one of them is a motorcycle, I get that one of them is a junker, and I get that one of them is something else, but -- it says, Mr. Tsaparas is continuing to search for information on the mileage and the VINs to provide to the plaintiff.

I actually laughed out loud when I read that sentence.

Okay. This is what I would do if I needed mileage on my car. I would walk out to my garage, I would open the garage door, I would open the door to the car, and I would look at the mileage. I would probably turn it on because you have to do that these days to look at the mileage, and I would look at the mileage.

Now, I get that one of these cars isn't workable.

That's not true for the Denali, is it? He drives the Denali.

So why the heck doesn't he go -- just turn on the gosh darn

car and see what the mileage is? And the VIN number, I mean, it's right there. VINs are in two places in a car, one of which is secret that only car dealers know about, and one of which is right inside the windshield. You go up to the windshield, you look in with pencil and paper in hand, and you write it down. Pretty easy to do.

So what am I to think, what am I to think as a judge who entered an order, when I'm told that somebody is still working on getting the VIN and the mileage for a working vehicle? I'm just talking about the Denali now. That's why I say I laughed out loud when I read it.

I can tell you what I think. It kind of goes back to a point I made before. Stall, delay, do nothing, shuffle, you know, pirouette, whatever, anything I can do to not comply with what the judge said and to delay the day of reckoning. That's what's happening here.

So do you have an explanation for me? Because if you don't, then the other thing that's going to happen at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning is that Mr. Tsaparas is going to be here and he's going to be up on the witness stand because I'm about to order him to show cause why he shouldn't be held in contempt of court.

MR. GAVRILOS: Yes, your Honor. So --

THE COURT: And the hearing on the contempt is going to be tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock.

1 MR. GAVRILOS: Yes, your Honor. And we've talked 2 about a number of vehicles with Mr. Tsaparas --3 THE COURT: Denali. 4 MR. GAVRILOS: -- with the Denali. So I do believe 5 that was part of the February 8th, 2024, citation production, 6 your Honor. There have been upwards of five or six 7 productions in total for both of the defendants, including the 8 supplements. We have emailed VIN numbers. I think we emailed 9 the VIN number for the Lancia to opposing counsel at some --10 THE COURT: Time out. This is your part of the 11 status report, docket 472 -- docket number 472, page 7: As to 12 the Lancia and the Ducati, Mr. Tsaparas is continuing to 13 search for information as to the mileage and VINs to provide 14 to the plaintiff. 15 MR. GAVRILOS: Right. That's not -- that's not the 16 Denali. 17 THE COURT: Oh. 18 That's the Lancia and the Ducati. MR. GAVRILOS: 19 THE COURT: Okay. So why hasn't he turned over the 20 Denali then? 21 MR. GAVRILOS: We haven't objected to that, your 22 That's kind of my point, is that the claim for Honor. 23 exemptions was for the BMW. 24 THE COURT: I ruled on it. 25 But that's the BMW. I'm asking about the Denali.

1 MR. GAVRILOS: Right. 2 THE COURT: Why hasn't he turned over the Denali? 3 MR. GAVRILOS: When you say turn over, how do you 4 mean, your Honor? Like drive it over? 5 THE COURT: Whatever. Give it to you to give to 6 them. I mean... 7 MR. GAVRILOS: Okay. Again, the VIN numbers, the 8 information, the registrations, again, all of that, as far as 9 I recall, your Honor, was part --10 THE COURT: Let me back up a little bit here. 11 The order was -- the order was, Discuss in good faith 12 agreed-upon arrangements for transfer and sale. 13 So the plaintiff's part of the status report Okay. 14 says, here's -- we made a proposal -- I said Denali. 15 a Suburban? 16 MR. GAVRILOS: Mr. Alexopoulos' vehicle is the 17 Suburban. 18 THE COURT: Okay. There's an error in your part of 19 the status report. 20 MR. WATTERS: My apologies, your Honor. We grouped 21 all the vehicles together in one. 22 THE COURT: Okay. So you don't say anything about 23 the Denali. 24 MR. WATTERS: Yes. And the reason for that, your 25 Honor, is my understanding from representations counsel made

1 is the Denali has been repossessed. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. WATTERS: So as a result, your Honor, with regard 4 to Mr. Tsaparas' vehicles that are the subject of the 5 July 12th, 2024, turnover order, we're looking at the Lancia 6 and the Ducati. 7 We already have the VIN number for the Ducati. It's 8 included in our portion of the joint status report. 9 As to the information about the Lancia, the VIN and 10 the mileage, I don't have an explanation. 11 THE COURT: Just a moment. 12 MR. WATTERS: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Maybe I need to just back up 14 further. 15 So in the amended -- the corrected order dated 16 July 15th, which is the corrections order entered I think the 17 Friday before that, which would have been the 12th, pages 10 18 and 11, motion to compel turnover as to Spiro Tsaparas, docket 19 number 439, the motion sought turnover of three vehicles, a 20 Ducati, a Lancia, and a Denali, and any firearms. 21 There's a discussion about exemptions, which I say, 22 they've already been asserted on other property, including the 23 BMW. 24 And then the last two sentences say, "The property in 25 question is, in fact, subject to turnover, and the Court

1 therefore grants NHC's motion. The parties should come to 2 court on July 15th prepared to discuss how the vehicles and 3 firearms get delivered and disposed of." 4 So the property includes the Denali, okay? 5 And so then -- I don't know if anybody -- I don't 6 recall being told that it -- it's possible that I was told on 7 the 15th of July that it was turned over, but I don't recall 8 it. 9 So nobody mentions anything about this in this status 10 report. 11 So is the Denali off the table at this point? 12 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I'm waiting for 13 documentation that counsel said they'd provide regarding the 14 repossession. 15 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, can I just briefly jump in 16 here, because my phone is about to die, and I did -- I'm 17 looking at an email February 8th, 2024: Additionally, we've 18 been advised that the VIN to Mr. Tsaparas' Lancia is 78611795. 19 That was sent five months ago. That was before Mr. Watters 20 That was sent to Ms. Marziani. was in the case. 21 I don't know if they directly put a line in here 22 saying that we did not provide the VIN number in the report, 23 but if they did, that is an untrue statement. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. 25 The question on the table is is what he said, what

1 Mr. Watters said, about the Denali correct? He said, I'll 2 just summarize it, that, we were waiting for confirmation that 3 the vehicle had been repossessed and we haven't gotten it yet. 4 So Denali, not Ducati, not Yukon, whatever the 5 motorcycle is, Denali, is he right? 6 MR. GAVRILOS: He's correct. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So why haven't you produced 8 information that it's already gone? 9 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, we've been told from --10 the client said it's difficult to get in touch with companies 11 who repossess your vehicles and they're not super amenable to 12 handing over documentation. 13 THE COURT: Doesn't a repossessor have to give notice 14 that they've repossessed something? 15 MR. GAVRILOS: They do, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: There's an Illinois statute that requires 17 that, to my recollection. 18 MR. GAVRILOS: It's in Colorado. I don't know what 19 the Colorado procedure is. 20 THE COURT: Yeah, I'm guessing there's a statute 21 pretty much everywhere. 22 MR. GAVRILOS: I can't speak to that. 23 THE COURT: Okay. I'm just going to say, 24 collectively, you guys must not think you're spending enough 25 time in this courtroom because you're just kind of begging to

spend more time in it.

Okay. Denali. So as far as I'm concerned, the Denali has just been erased from my memory. I don't care about it anymore. If you get it -- if you have something else to order me to do, then you'll file a motion. You guys don't have any trouble filing stuff either. So I'm not going to ask about it anymore.

Now I'm back to paragraph 6 of plaintiff's part of the status report.

So the first vehicle is a Suburban, which I gather is Mr. Alexopoulos' vehicle. No? Is that Mr. --

MR. GAVRILOS: Yes, your Honor. 2018 Suburban.

THE COURT: Okay. So your thing has a mistake because it says Mr. Tsaparas. Is it supposed to say Mr. Alexopoulos?

MR. WATTERS: That's my -- that's my mistake, your Honor. We --

THE COURT: Your proposal was to be, give us a power of attorney to sign over the title, the registration, the keys, the remotes, blah, blah, blah, and we've got an offer based on 42,000 miles.

The defendant's part of the status report says, it's not 42,000 miles. It's 130,000 miles. It's not worth that much. He owes 10 grand on a loan. We should submit valuations, and Mr. Alexopoulos wants to apply his statutory

1 exemptions to determine if it's subject to turnover. 2 So which exemption would that be? 3 MR. GAVRILOS: There's two exemptions, your Honor: 4 There's a vehicle exemption, there's a wild card exemption. 5 THE COURT: What's -- remind me what the number --6 the amount is on the vehicle? 7 MR. GAVRILOS: The amount -- the exemption for the vehicle? I believe it's 2500, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: That sounds about right. 10 MR. WATTERS: I believe it's 2400, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: It was below 5,000 is what I --12 MR. WATTERS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Okay. And then there's the wild card. 14 Has he used any of his wild card on anything else? 15 MR. GAVRILOS: Neither of the judgment debtors have 16 applied any of their exemptions. 17 THE COURT: That's false. Mr. Tsaparas had. 18 thought my order was wrong in that regard, you would have 19 filed a motion to reconsider, and I know you would have 20 because you file a motion to reconsider on just about 21 everything. 22 Page -- hang on a second -- the corrected order of 23 July 15th, pages 10 and 11, I'm summarizing, NHC seeks 24 turnover of three vehicles in Mr. Tsaparas' possession. With 25 respect to Ms. Tsaparas' statutory exemptions, his earlier

filing asserted his \$2400 motor vehicle exemption on a BMW, not one of the vehicles sought in NHC's current motion, and asserted a thousand dollars of his wild card exemption on the same BMW and the remaining \$3,000 on certain jewelry. Thus, the items sought by the current motion for turnover order are not the subject of any exemption claims by Mr. Tsaparas. As a result, there's nothing the Court has to adjudicate at this time regarding those exemptions.

What you just said has been ruled on.

Back to my question, though. So -- and now I got to remember my question.

MR. GAVRILOS: So just to be clear, your Honor, if you denied those exemptions with respect to that claim --

THE COURT: Not "if." I just read it to you. And, presumably, you read it when you got it, you know, three weeks ago.

MR. GAVRILOS: So then he still has all of his exemptions available for use?

THE COURT: I adjudicate exemptions that get asserted, and that's discussed at page 9 in the context of Mr. Alexopoulos, but it applies to everybody. No payment order may be entered unless the judgment debtors had an opportunity to exert exemptions.

The way that doesn't work -- the way it does -- not going to work, even though you think it is, is that every time

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
something happens, there's, oh, I want to do this, oh, a
motion to reconsider, oh, assert an exemption, and this
                         No.
                              I'm sorry. He had an
process goes on forever.
opportunity to assert his exemption on these vehicles.
                                                       He
didn't.
         No.
         MR. GAVRILOS: He did, your Honor. Document
number 298 was filed on --
         THE COURT: Well, then why didn't you file a motion
to reconsider when I concluded that he had -- that he didn't?
         MR. GAVRILOS: I did not know that his exemptions
were ever ruled on. I guess at that point, they'd been
pending for eight months. They were filed pursuant to court
order on November 17th of 2023.
         THE COURT: What was the exemption?
         MR. GAVRILOS: For Mr. Alexopoulos?
         THE COURT: We're talking about Mr. Tsaparas.
was the exemption that you said was filed nine months ago?
         MR. GAVRILOS: He filed an exemption related to his
wages pursuant to 1402(b)(3). He filed his motor vehicle
exemptions --
         THE COURT:
                    Right.
         MR. GAVRILOS: -- pursuant to --
         THE COURT: And that was on the BMW.
         MR. GAVRILOS:
                       Correct.
         THE COURT: Right? Which I just talked about, right?
```

1 MR. GAVRILOS: He filed -- or asserted his wild card 2 exemption --3 THE COURT: On the BMW and on jewelry, right? 4 MR. GAVRILOS: Right. 5 THE COURT: Just talked about that too. 6 So what other exemptions are there? 7 MR. GAVRILOS: Well, if you denied those exemptions, 8 he still has them. THE COURT: I didn't. He's asserted them, and I --9 10 they've been applied. That is pages 10 and 11, which I've now 11 actually read twice during this hearing today. I've read it 12 twice during this hearing today. Plus, you read it, 13 presumably, when you read the gosh darn order. Okay? 14 So he's asserted them, they've been applied, and you 15 don't get to keep applying them to other things. 16 MR. GAVRILOS: I misunderstood the language of that 17 order, your Honor. I apologize. 18 THE COURT: Okay. So now let me go back to my 19 question, which -- because every question gets diverted off to 20 something else, I now have to go back like four pages in the 21 transcript to just find it. 22 So we were talking about the Suburban. He doesn't 23 have any exemptions left to assert on the Suburban, does he? 24 MR. GAVRILOS: The Suburban is Mr. Alexopoulos' 25 vehicle.

1 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Not the Suburban. 2 Okay. So Mr. Alexopoulos, is he asserting his 3 vehicle exemption on a Suburban? 4 MR. GAVRILOS: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Alexopoulos' 5 position this whole time is that he's stacking all of his 6 exemptions so he can keep his vehicle because that is the only 7 means that he has to and from work. 8 THE COURT: So that would be the \$2400 or whatever it 9 is vehicle exemption --10 MR. GAVRILOS: Plus the 4,000 wild card. 11 THE COURT: -- and then whatever is needed out of the 12 wild card exemption to get to the value --13 MR. GAVRILOS: Correct. 14 THE COURT: And is the value of the vehicle 15 determined based on its book value, or do you have to 16 deduct -- your position is do you have to deduct from it 17 what's owed on it? 18 MR. GAVRILOS: That's a good question, your Honor. 19 would say the latter. I mean, there's not a whole lot of case 20 law on the mechanics of how to value a vehicle for purposes of 21 a turnover. It would stand to reason on the defendant's side 22 that you take what it was purchased at, subtract the residual, 23 subtract the loan because that cuts against the interest, 24 apply the exemption, and if that number is greater than 25 zero --

1 THE COURT: Probably would. Is the loan --2 presumably, whoever has the loan has a security interest in 3 it. 4 MR. GAVRILOS: I would assume so, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Usually that's the case. Most car 6 dealers aren't stupid enough not to do that. Okay. 7 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, if I can --THE COURT: Have you gotten any kind of a 8 9 verification on the mileage on the thing at this point? 10 MS. MARZIANI: No. 11 MR. WATTERS: No verification, your Honor, but we did 12 receive the new mileage number after the status report was 13 submitted. Thereafter, we went out and got a new offer based 14 on the mileage that counsel has represented. 15 So the math I have, your Honor, is we have an offer 16 on the vehicle for \$17,000. 17 THE COURT: And something like 10 is owed-ish. 18 MR. WATTERS: Okay. Well, I'm being told Kelley Blue 19 Book might say 20, but we have -- we have an offer for 17, 20 though. 21 There's 9,700 owed on the loan, and then --22 THE COURT: 9,700. 23 MR. WATTERS: Right. 24 And then there was a \$2400 exemption under -- for the 25 vehicle exemption that was in the Court's July order.

1 That means we clear approximately \$5,000. 2 THE COURT: It's about 4900 is what would it be. 3 But what I'm -- he's going to assert his wild card 4 against that, and the wild card is -- tell me again how 5 much --6 MR. GAVRILOS: 4,000. 7 THE COURT: So that gets you down to 900 bucks. 8 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, to the extent the Court's 9 willing to let him now exert the wild card exemption, it's a 10 lot less than we were hoping for, but at this point, we'll 11 take any amount of money I can get. 12 THE COURT: So translate that into --13 MR. WATTERS: Sorry, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: You're asking me --15 My understanding from the Court's July MR. WATTERS: 16 order was the only exemption that was raised and that the 17 Court ruled on was the \$2400 exemption, and the question 18 was --19 THE COURT: Mr. Gavrilos told me that this has been 20 asserted like nine months ago. 21 MR. WATTERS: I can't speak to that, but I assume it 22 was, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: I assume he's right, okay? 24 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, ultimately, even if we 25 clear only 500 or \$900, I'd like --

1 THE COURT: You still want to do it. 2 MR. WATTERS: -- I'd like to sell it. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MR. GAVRILOS: And, your Honor, that's based on an 5 offer that they got -- it -- there's clearly a dispute here. 6 I know the Court believes that the defendants and third-party 7 respondents call for a hearing at the drop of a hat. We don't believe that that's the case, but --8 9 THE COURT: No, no, it's not call for a hearing at 10 the drop of a hat. It's filing motions to reconsider at the 11 drop of a hat. Those are two different issues. 12 MR. GAVRILOS: This issue, your Honor, 13 Mr. Alexopoulos just simply needs to keep his car. 14 THE COURT: So I get what you're saying, and so are 15 you saying that you're not persuaded -- you think there's a 16 dispute about whether once all the exemptions get applied, 17 whether there's actually any value left. 18 MR. GAVRILOS: Correct, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: And so what you're asking me to do is 20 make a determination on what the value would be or what the 21 value is. 22 MR. GAVRILOS: No, your Honor. I'm -- I would 23 suggest that pursuant to 277(h), that there would be a 24 hearing. If they're not willing to concede --25 THE COURT: That's what happens -- so that's a yes.

1 I mean, you want me to make a determination on the value after 2 having a hearing. 3 Essentially, your Honor. MR. GAVRILOS: 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. GAVRILOS: If it's going to come down to a 6 hearing over 500 bucks, I mean, it doesn't seem --7 THE COURT: Does the law -- does the Sixth Amendment 8 apply to this? I mean, does it have to be live testimony 9 under oath with the right to confront witnesses and whatnot, 10 or can the hearing be done on paper? 11 MR. GAVRILOS: In light of the fact, your Honor, that 12 the general case law says that these proceedings should be 13 swift, cheap, and informal, I would say that you have 14 discretion to do it by paper if you'd like. 15 THE COURT: Okay. So let me just kind of lay this 16 out here. 17 So if all of your numbers are right, you're going to 18 clear 900 bucks. So here's what you're going to have to do to 19 clear the 900 bucks. I'm going to use the term "clear" 20 advisedly because it's going to turn out that you're not going 21 to actually clear anything. 22 You're going to have to file paperwork with me to 23 persuade me what the value of the vehicle is, and that's going 24 to have to include some sort of an affidavit from somebody 25 that says, this is the offer that we have on this vehicle;

it's going to have to include something about, you know, what's owed on it; it's going to have to include, you know, a filing of some sort.

I don't know what your hourly rate is. My guess is of the 900, we're going to probably use about 775 or so, and so we're talking about 125. I'd throw in 5 bucks to get to the 125, but you got to decide whether it's worth it or not. You don't have to decide it right now, but you got to decide it pretty soon.

MR. WATTERS: I understand.

THE COURT: Because if the message hasn't come through, this is no more fun for me than it is for you guys, okay? It's no more fun for me than it is for you to be -- to have these hearings about every four weeks where I'm dealing with what a rational person might call in some instances the least minutia. I mean, I'll do it. That's what I get paid the big bucks for.

So you're going to have to decide whether you want to do that. Because I think Mr. Gavrilos is right, that's the next step. It seems to me there's at least a factual question on whether there's enough once all the exemptions are asserted, which he has now asserted and I have adjudicated that he's applying them to the Suburban, okay? Done, that's done, so we're not going to be coming back and dealing with that again. It's whether it's worth it or not. So you have

1 to make a decision. MR. WATTERS: Understood, your Honor. Could I make a 2 3 quick request, though? 4 THE COURT: What's the request? 5 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, we've had a representation 6 from counsel in writing by email as to the mileage of the car. 7 If I --8 THE COURT: Somebody take a picture of it? 9 MR. WATTERS: If I could get --10 THE COURT: Just take a picture of it. Tell somebody 11 to just go in there and snap a picture of the odometer once 12 the car is turned on so -- and back far enough so they can 13 tell it's actually a Suburban and not, you know, the next-door 14 neighbor's high school kid's car. 15 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, I'm sorry. If I may, I 16 hate to ask, but given everything that's happened so far, can 17 we get a date certain for that to be produced? 18 THE COURT: Yeah, I'm going to start charging by the 19 hour in this case, by the way. That's a half of a joke. 20 Sure. What's the deadline that I gave on the --21 there was something I just gave a deadline on. 22 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor --23 THE COURT: He ought to be able -- Mr. Alexopoulos, 24 he's the guy who lives in Niles, right? 25 MR. GAVRILOS: Correct.

1 THE COURT: And the Suburban is in Niles, as far as 2 you know? 3 MR. GAVRILOS: No, because at this point, this is a 4 car that he shares with his wife. It's the only care they 5 I don't know if he has it with him. 6 THE COURT: Oh, no, I mean -- I'm talking -- it's not 7 like in California or something like that. It's here. 8 MR. GAVRILOS: I would be very surprised if it was in California. 9 10 THE COURT: Okay. Get a photograph of the odometer 11 within a week, a week from today. That's the 14th. 12 Okay. Now we're over to -- I think those are all the 13 items on the plaintiff's part of the status report, and now 14 we're over on the defense side, most of which, I think, have 15 already been covered. Exemptions, that's been covered. 16 Suburban, we talked about. 17 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, can I just revisit one 18 point on the status report? 19 THE COURT: Not just yet. 20 The trailer, we talked about. The firearms, we 21 talked about. Amundsen Davis, we talked about. 22 Okay. Now you can raise the point. 23 MR. GAVRILOS: Yeah. I don't quite know how to put 24 this diplomatically, but we just had a discussion about 25 something that I put in the status report, and I was

1 personally directed to provide an affidavit. You told me that 2 I'd testify under oath, and there was a suggestion that I 3 would be escorted out the door and into jail. 4 I just --5 THE COURT: No. Actually, you misread that. 6 when people get held in contempt, that's what sometimes 7 happens. 8 MR. GAVRILOS: I just pointed out that something on 9 their side of the status report that we spent a great deal of 10 time talking about was demonstrably false --11 THE COURT: What was said --12 MR. GAVRILOS: -- and that was that they do have the 13 VIN information for the Lancia. It's in the report. It's not 14 I told you the email that we sent it to them. 15 So I'm just wondering is there going to be any sort 16 of similar recourse along those lines? 17 THE COURT: Where? In the status report? 18 Sure. I'll tell you what. If I send you out the 19 side door, I'll send them out the side door too. 20 So where in the status report am I supposed to be 21 looking for this, Mr. Gavrilos? You just told me --22 MR. GAVRILOS: I believe it was page 3. 23 THE COURT: Page 3. 24 And what part of it? 25 MR. GAVRILOS: On the vehicles, your Honor, talking

1	about the Tsaparas vehicle saying, no information has been
2	provided.
3	And then they told you in open court that they did
4	not have the VIN number for the Lancia.
5	THE COURT: Now, wait a second.
6	MR. GAVRILOS: And as I told you, Judge, the email
7	that went to them was on February 8th.
8	THE COURT: You just talked to me about something
9	being false in the status report
10	MR. GAVRILOS: Right. And also in open court just
11	now.
12	THE COURT: You talked to me about something being
13	false in the status report. I'm going to take these things
14	one at a time. Do you have a copy of the status report?
15	MR. GAVRILOS: I have a
16	THE COURT: Here, here is a copy of the status
17	report. Tell me what it was. There's page 3. Tell me what
18	it was that was false so I know what to ask.
19	MR. GAVRILOS: NHC will obtain an offer in advance of
20	the sale if Mr. Tsaparas provides the VIN.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. GAVRILOS: That was on February 8th, 2024.
23	THE COURT: This is on the Lancia.
24	MR. GAVRILOS: Correct.
25	THE COURT: Remind me, is the Lancia the that's

```
1
    not the motorcycle. That's the --
 2
              MR. GAVRILOS: Correct.
 3
              THE COURT: -- that's the car that I referred to as a
 4
    junker, basically.
 5
              MR. GAVRILOS: Correct.
 6
              THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. So you're telling me you
 7
    had the VIN?
 8
              MR. GAVRILOS:
                           I'm telling you they had the VIN.
              THE COURT: Okay. Do you have the VIN?
 9
10
              MR. GAVRILOS: It was sent on February 8th, 2024. I
11
    can show you the email.
12
              THE COURT: Show it to me.
13
              Is it in the attachment?
14
              MR. GAVRILOS: No, it's in the subject of the email.
15
              MS. HERRING:
                            It's in the body of the email.
16
              MR. GAVRILOS: The body of the email.
17
              THE COURT: Got it. This is dated February 8th of
18
    2024.
19
              Okay. So what's going on here, folks?
20
              MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, that email predates my
21
     involvement, obviously --
22
              THE COURT: I'm going to stop you right there.
23
              MR. WATTERS: Yes, your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: Hang on one second.
25
              Yeah, Ms. Marziani's name is on this status report
```

too. It doesn't predate her involvement.

MR. WATTERS: It doesn't, your Honor, and the only thing I would say --

THE COURT: So, Ms. Marziani, did you look at this status report before you put your name on it?

MS. MARZIANI: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: And when you got to the part where it says, "Will obtain an offer if Mr. Tsaparas provides VIN" -- now, it doesn't come right out and say he never provided the VIN, it doesn't say that in so many words, but that's the pretty clear implication of it and what I'm supposed to take away from it. So did -- how did you overlook that?

MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, I don't recall that email in February. Your Honor ordered this information in April, ordered the pictures in April. If they had provided the information to me in an email, perhaps they could have pointed it out then.

I -- without checking my emails on my computer, I don't know if I have that VIN number.

THE COURT: Okay. That's not a good screw-up. It's a pretty bad screw-up. And I'll just make this observation, is that if you guys actually filed joint status reports and actually talked about them in advance before you did them like most lawyers do, this would have come out in the wash because Mr. Gavrilos would say, hey, we sent it to you in February,

and you wouldn't have put the damn thing in there. Pardon me for the "damn."

But, I mean, you guys sent the draft of the status report if I'm seeing -- if I'm reading the response to the order to show cause correctly. The status report was due on the 29th, okay? 29th, which was a Monday of July. You sent the status -- you sent a draft of the status report at 5:04 p.m. on Friday the 26th.

Now, look, I work -- people think this is a cushy job. I work pretty much eight hours a day Saturday and Sunday, and I know that that's true of lawyers too, but it's not supposed to be that way. It's not reasonable, it's not reasonable on a status report that's due on Monday, to give your draft to the other side at 5:00 o'clock -- 5:04 on the Friday before. It's just not reasonable. It basically requires the other person to work the weekend, which you chose not to do because you dumped it on them probably as you knew they were going out the door.

MS. MARZIANI: May I respond?

THE COURT: You can respond any way you want. It's a fact. You dumped it on them at 5:04 p.m. This is what your filing says.

MS. MARZIANI: The proposal for the sale was sent to them on Thursday.

THE COURT: Oh.

1 MS. MARZIANI: And --2 THE COURT: Oh, so it was a whole day before. 3 at 4:17 p.m. on July 25th, according to your response? 4 MS. MARZIANI: Yes. 5 THE COURT: Do you detect a note of sarcasm? That 6 means your sarcasm detector is working. 7 MS. MARZIANI: Your Honor, I apologize for the 8 timing, but we were waiting for --9 THE COURT: So, look, everybody's waiting on 10 everybody else. Everybody's waiting on everybody else. 11 Here's the deal. You guys need -- you know, you're 12 having to file these status reports. I'm going to say the 13 obvious here. When you get something that says a status 14 report's due on X, you should -- before you walk out the door, 15 you should -- before you walk out the door after you've gotten the order, you should say, okay, let's agree on who's going to 16 17 get whose draft to whom when. And maybe you send simultaneous 18 things and everybody works on it, or maybe one side goes 19 first. That's what people do. I used to practice law. 20 That's what I did. That's what people -- like I say, people 21 do in the 279 of the 280 cases I got or whatever it is. You 22 guys don't seem to. 23

MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, we actually have an order on this point where the first iteration from the plaintiff's side --

24

25

1 THE COURT: We talked about this before? 2 MR. GAVRILOS: Many times. The first draft is 3 supposed to be three days before it's due. Our response --4 THE COURT: And I'm predicting the response, it was 5 because it was Friday and it was due Monday. 6 MR. GAVRILOS: I don't know what the response is 7 going to be. 8 THE COURT: And I didn't say business days, and so, 9 therefore, it's technical compliance. 10 So, look, I get your point, okay? We've talked about 11 it before. You should have gotten this sooner. Just -- I 12 mean, are you having fun yet? Because I'm not, and I'm 13 guessing you're not either. 14 And the whole reason why we're even here today -- I 15 mean, I could have issued the order denying the two motions to 16 reconsider from my couch at home. I could have made an entry 17 on the docket doing that. 18 You're here because of this mess about the status 19 reports, which is a recurring problem in this case. You know, 20 which is a problem in, you know -- if I have 280 cases, I 21 don't know if it's plus or minus, at any given time, this goes 22 back 25 years, I have three cases that's a problem. Three 23 cases out of 280. You are number one. 24 But the other 277 people figure it out somehow. 25 somehow figure it out. And you guys -- I get that there's a

lot of emotion and rancor and all sorts of stuff involved in this case, you know, maybe including the lawyers, although it shouldn't, maybe including the lawyers, but at least including the clients. But for crying out loud, you just got to find a way. And you should agree on it, whether it's one side gives their version -- gives a draft first and the other side responds and you have specific days you're going to do that by given the due date, or whether both sides send their sections and then you sit down to try to combine them. I mean, it's not rocket science.

I mean, none of us is going to get this hour back, right? We're never going to get this hour back. And I'm one of those people. I'm not going to get the hour back. I just -- and it's probably about the 18th time I've said it in this case, I've just kind of reached the end of my rope. And that's why I whistled you in here. And even when I got the compliant -- more or less compliant status report the same day, I'm not backing off on that because I just -- this is not working the way it's supposed to.

So you got to figure it out. I mean, really, when people come -- when I did the thing, and I honestly had forgotten doing it, but I said, you know, the draft's got to go out three days before, do you know how many times I've done that in 25 years? One. It's the only time. I've never had to do that. I've never had to do that before. I don't even

1 do it on the pretrial order, frankly, where I say, you know, 2 you've got to get your draft, because people work it out. 3 I've never had to do it before. The this is the only time 4 in 25 years that I've ever had to tell somebody when they have 5 to get a draft of a status report to somebody else. 6 So do with that what you want. 7 What else do I have to decide today that I haven't 8 already decided? 9 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, I just have one quick 10 comment. You asked Mr. Alexopoulos to produce a photograph of 11 the mileage of the Suburban I believe in a week. You also 12 asked him to produce a photograph of the trailer by 5:00 13 tomorrow. 14 THE COURT: Yeah, that can be -- that can be a week 15 too. 16 MR. GAVRILOS: Okay. Would you like an affidavit 17 still accompanying that photo --18 THE COURT: But here's the deal. 19 MS. HERRING: I have them right here. 20 I have the photos, Judge. 21 THE COURT: Yay. 22 MS. HERRING: I sent him a quick text. I've got 23 them. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Can you give her a number to text 25 them to?

1 MR. WATTERS: Sure. THE COURT: Okay. Like before you get to the back 2 3 door. 4 MR. WATTERS: Understood, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: It doesn't have to be right now. Before 6 you get to the back door. 7 So that part's off the table. The other thing is just a week. Okay? So you don't have to worry about the 8 9 photos anymore. 10 So what else do I have to decide that I haven't 11 already decided? 12 MR. GAVRILOS: Nothing from defendants, your Honor. 13 MR. WATTERS: Your Honor, the only thing --14 THE COURT: I have to decide when I'm going to make 15 you people come back, but that's another issue. 16 MR. WATTERS: I apologize, your Honor. I didn't 17 mean --18 THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead. 19 MR. WATTERS: The only other thing on our radar was, 20 as the Court's obviously well aware, we've had a number of 21 citations issued. 22 One of the third parties we've been working with on a 23 citation has completed its production, and they've asked and 24 we've agreed to withdraw the citation. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Which one?

1 MR. WATTERS: Teller, Levit & Silvertrust. 2 THE COURT: That's a law firm, right? 3 MR. WATTERS: It is. 4 If the Court wants to put it in the minute order, 5 that'd be fine. Otherwise, I'm happy to try to --6 THE COURT: Before you leave here, give the name of 7 the law firm to my courtroom deputy clerk. We'll say that 8 that citation is withdrawn. 9 MR. WATTERS: Understood, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Are there any others that are about to 11 expire that I need to deal with or anything like that, or --12 MR. WATTERS: We're working with everyone else, your 13 Honor. Nothing else comes to mind immediately. 14 THE COURT: All right. Okay. We're done. 15 MR. WATTERS: Thank you, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Oh, the next status hearing is going to 17 be in four weeks. That's September the 4th. 18 MR. GAVRILOS: Your Honor, for some reason, I thought 19 there was a hearing on the 19th or the 29th. I'm happy to 20 strike that --21 THE COURT: Of this month? 22 MR. GAVRILOS: Of this month. 23 MR. WATTERS: Yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: What's it on? 25 MS. MARZIANI: The 29th.

1 THE COURT: What's it on? 2 MR. WATTERS: As to the content of it, I think it's 3 just for status. 4 THE COURT: It's just a status hearing? We don't 5 need to do it that fast. So that one's stricken. I'm going 6 to make it -- actually, not the 4th. Let's make it the 11th 7 of September at 9:15 in person, and the status report is due 8 on the 4th. So figure out before you get back there who's 9 getting who a draft when. 10 All right. See you. 11 MR. WATTERS: Thank you, your Honor. 12 (Which were all the proceedings had in the above-entitled 13 cause on the day and date aforesaid.) 14 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 15 /s/ Carolyn R. Cox, RPR, F/CRR August 8, 2024 16 Official Court Reporter United States District Court 17 Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25